

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CECIL ELMORE, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
STARBUCKS COFFEE COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:24-cv-10259-FLA (BFMx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
CONSOLIDATED WITH CECIL
ELMORE, JR. V. STARBUCKS
CORPORATION, CASE NO. 2:25-CV-
00768-FLA (BFMx)**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE


Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a), a court may consolidate actions involving “a common question of law or fact” and has “broad discretion under this rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Invs. Rsch. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989); *see also In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987) (“trial courts may consolidate cases *sua sponte*”) (citation omitted). “To determine whether to consolidate, a court weighs the interest in judicial convenience against the potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice caused by consolidation.” *Paxonet Commc’ns, Inc. v. TranSwitch Corp.*, 303 F. Supp. 2d 1027, 1028 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (citation omitted).

Here, it appears the benefits of judicial economy and convenience from consolidating this action with *Cecil Elmore, Jr. v. Starbucks Corporation*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00768-FLA (BFMx) (“*Elmore II*”) outweigh any potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice, as Plaintiff asserts the same or similar claims against the same Defendant in each action.

Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing only within fourteen (14) days of this Order why this action should not be consolidated with *Elmore II*. Responses shall be limited to five (5) pages in length. Failure to respond timely may result in the consolidation of the actions without further notice from the court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 27, 2025


FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA
United States District Judge